



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

85 Tenn. 55. And the rights of the holder of a common law lien should be no greater. *Eichelberger v. Miller*, 20 Md. 332. Neither legal nor equitable title is necessary to an insurable interest, and the holder of a lien may insure to the extent of his claim. *Insurance Co. v. Stinson*, 103 U. S. 25; *Kohrbach v. Germania Fire Insurance Co.*, 62 N. Y. 47. Thus the plaintiff in the principal case might have protected himself fully, and there seems little reason to make any implication in his favor. See *Mosser v. Donaldson*, 10 Atl. 766 (Pa.).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY CONGRESS — ACTION BY THE COURTS PENDING INVESTIGATION BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.— The plaintiffs were shippers on the defendant railroad which filed notice of a new schedule of rates. The plaintiffs, claiming that the new rates would cause irreparable injury, sued in equity to prevent their establishment pending a determination of their reasonableness by the Interstate Commerce Commission. *Held*, that the bill be dismissed. *Atlantic Coast Line Ry. Co. v. Macon Grocery Co.*, 166 Fed. 206 (C. C. A., Fifth Circ., Jan. 5, 1909). See NOTES, p. 524.

MORTGAGES — EQUITY OF REDEMPTION — MORTGAGEE'S RIGHT TO CONSOLIDATE MORTGAGES. — The owner of certain lots of land mortgaged them to the defendant. The equities of redemption he assigned to the plaintiff, who later acquired the equity of redemption in another lot, also mortgaged to the defendant, but not by the same mortgagor, and expressly excepted from the provisions of the Conveyancing Act, 1881. The plaintiff tendered the amount due on this last mortgage, but the defendant claimed the right to consolidate all the mortgages. *Held*, that the plaintiff may redeem this mortgage separately. *Sharp v. Rickards*, 99 L. T. R. 916 (Eng., Ch., Nov. 11, 1908).

It was formerly well established law in England that when a mortgagee acquired several mortgages on various estates, all given by the same mortgagor, he could consolidate his claims as against either the mortgagor or his assignee. *Vint v. Padget*, 2 De G. & J. 611. This rule was based on the ground that he who seeks equity must do equity, but its justice in practice was frequently questioned, and it was abolished by the Conveyancing Act, 1881, except where the right was expressly reserved in one of the mortgage deeds. 44 & 45 VICT. c. 41. The general rule in our courts has always been that a mortgagee can only demand payment of the debt due and covered by the mortgage sought to be redeemed. *Cohn v. Hoffman*, 56 Ark. 119. But the mortgagee has been allowed to consolidate a claim arising out of the same transaction in which the mortgage was given; so also a claim for money expended in protecting the property or title. *Burgett v. Osborne*, 172 Ill. 227; *Robinson v. Ryan*, 25 N. Y. 320. The principal case recognizes that on equitable grounds the English rule in so far as it still prevails should not be extended to a case where the mortgages were executed by different mortgagors.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS — OFFICERS AND AGENTS — EFFECT OF RE-ELECTION AFTER OUSTER. — The charter of New York City provided that the president of a borough, an officer chosen by popular vote, might be removed for cause by the governor, and that a vacancy should be filled by a majority of the aldermen from the borough. The defendant, having been so removed, was immediately selected by the aldermen for the remainder of his original term. *Held*, that he is not entitled to the office. *People v. Ahearn*, 40 N. Y. L. J. 2477 (N. Y., App. Div., March, 1909).

For a discussion of the principles involved, see 20 HARV. L. REV. 316.

NEW TRIAL — GROUNDS FOR GRANTING NEW TRIAL — ERRONEOUS INSTRUCTION MERELY AS TO DAMAGES. — A statute prescribed "a new trial" as the remedy for prejudicial error committed during a trial, but neither expressly authorized nor expressly prohibited retrial of part of the issues. After